

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/575,136	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR	Art Unit 1625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NIZAL S. CHANDRAKUMAR. (3) _____.

(2) Stephanie A. Barbosa. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-83.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Searchability of process claims 1-76 was discussed. It was agreed that a new restriction requirement in consideration of the independent claims would be filed. Applicants would have the option to elect groups relating to processes or groups relating to compounds.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NC/	
------	--